UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

PATCHAREE NEWMAN,

Plaintiff,

VERIFIED ANSWER

-against-

Case Number: 07 Civ. 4083

(SCR)

SOUND SHORE MEDICAL CENTER of WESTCHESTER,

Defendant.

Defendant Sound Shore Medical Center by its attorney, Eileen M. O'Rourke, answers the

Complaint filed M: y 25. 2()7 as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Defendant admits plaint if yu por site has her action on a violation of plaintiff's federally guaranteed constitutional rights and her rights as otherwise guaranteed under law, but do in seach and every whereally gation, entouth in paragraph 1 of the Complaint.
- 2. Defendant adr ints that plain to f seeks man stary consperse tion and other damages under the referenced statutes but denies each and every other allegation set forth in paragraph 1 of the Completion.
- 3. Defendant denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 3 of the Complaint.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. Defendant denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 4 of the Complaint.
- 5. Defendant denies each and every other allegation set forth in paragraph 5 of the Complaint.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS

6. Defendant denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 6 of the Complaint.

2017. Defendant denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a select as to the struth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 7 of the Complaint.

8. Defendant adraits the allegations let for a in paragraph 8 of the Complaint.

ALI EGATIO'AS

- 9. Defendant repeats each and every response to the allegations contained in paragraphs "1 'to ' 3" as 1 th by were set forth he e'n.
- 10. Defendant admits the allegation set forth in paragraph 10 of the Complaint
- 11. Defendant de lies the alles ations set for it in para; r.ph 11 of the Complaint.
- 12. Defendant denies the aliegations set forth in paragraph 12 of the Complaint.
- 13. Defendant der ies the fillegations set forth in garagraph 15 of the Complaint
- 14. Defendant admiss the aliegations set forth in paragraph 14 of the Complaint.

- 16. Defendant denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 16 of the Complaint.
- 17. Defendant denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 17 of the Complaint.
- 18. Defendant denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 18 of the Complaint.
- 19. Defendant denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 19 of the Complaint
- 20. Defendant admits the allegations set forth in paragraph 20 of the Complaint.
- 21. Defendant denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the matrix set of imparagraph 21 c. the C mg air.
- 22. Defendant cenies the anegations set forth ... paragraph 22 of the Complaint

AS FOR A FIRST CAUCE OF ACTION BASED OF CACT IN ATIONAL ORIGIN UNDER FITTLY V.T. D TIE CYT. LIST LTS A C.7 OF 1964

- 23. Defendant repeats each and every response to the allegations contained in paragraphs '1' to "2' as ftl ey we's et orthrere n
- 24. Defendant denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 24 of the Complaint.
- 25. Defendant der ies the all stions et for ... in para 31 aph 2: of the Complaint.

AS FOR A SECUND CAUSE OF ACTION BASED ON RACE/NATIONAL ORIGIN UNDER NEW YORK EXECUTIVE LAW §290

26. Defendant repeats each and every response to the altegations contained in paragraphs "1" to "25" as if they were set forth herein.

28. Defendant denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 28 of the Complaint.

AS FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION BASED ON DISABILITY PURSUANT TO TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

- 29. Defendant repeats each and every response to the allegations contained in paragraphs "1" to "28" as if they were set forth herein.
- 30. Defendant denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 30 of the Complaint.
- 31. Defendant denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 31 of the Complaint.

CONTRACTOR A FOURTH COURSE OF ACTION 3. SECONDISATILITY SELAW §2.90

- 32. Defendant repeats each and every response to the allegations contained in paragraphs "1" to "1" as it iey veres as for h h main.
- 33. Defendant denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 33 of the Complaint.
- 34. Defendant der iller iller ations set iller from per grant 34 of the Complaint.

EVALUATION

1. Plaintiff's complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted against defendant.

Page 4 of 7

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

2. Plaintiff's claims are barred to the extent that plaintiff has failed to satisfy jurisdictional prerequisites for commencement of this action.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

3. Plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

4. Plaintiff's claims may be barred, in whole or in part, by the principles of waiver, estopppel, laches, and/or unclean hands.

FILTH AFFIRM ATIVE DEFENSE

'laintif s claim are farr d in whole or in a t by h apolic blosta u s of limitations.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

6. Plaintiff is not extitle 3.3 punitive during sale mater of law because defendants at no time engaged in discriminatory practices with malice or with reckless r difference to plain iff angles.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

7. The decision and act also or failures to act if it y, respecting Plaintiff were justified by legitimate non-discriminatory reasons and based on factors other that national on y n, also or disability.

EI 7H' TAFFIRN A TVE DI LENGI.

8. Plaintiff's impairment did not limit a major life activity.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

9. Plaintiff's limitation was not substantial.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

10. Plaintiff's limitation was not permanent or long-term.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

11. Defendant is not required to accommodate plaintiff's prolonged illness by allowing her an indefinite leave of absence.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

12. Plaintiff'a disability was not brown to the employer.

TAR FEER TI TIFIRN ATIVE DELE (SI

3. Frantifi never sought a "reasonable accommodation."

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

14. A reasona ile acco nn edation would be ai ur just bur en on the defendant.

FIFTHEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

15. Plaintifi was et ga ged in othe temployman v/hilo on rue lical leave from defendar t

New Rochelle, New York

June 25, 2007

Ei ver M. C'T.our's, E q. (EMO9144)

A ... n. ey foi 1 lefei a ant

Sound Snore Medical Center

of Westchester

16 Guio i Pare

N... Rc shells, N.? 914-565-4815

activePDF Composer

EVALUATION
EVALUATION
EVALUACIÓN
EVALUATION